DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 953 EA 006 869

AUTHOR Barrilleaux, Louis E.; Schermerhorn, John R., Jr.
TITLE Managing an "Organistically-Oriented" School Intervention Program.
PUB DATE Apr 75
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (60th, Washington, D.C., March 31-April 4, 1975)
AVAILABLE FROM Middle-Management Center, Center for Education, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118 ($2.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS..PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Change Strategies; *Consultation Programs; Educational Change; *Guidelines; Interpersonal Relationship; Intervention; *Organizational Change; *Organizational Development; Organizational Theories; Program Design; School Organization

ABSTRACT

An "organic" relationship between change agents and clients is a well-popularized goal in recent literature on planned change and organization development. There is, however, a dearth of literature on how to manage change programs under parameters set by this organic value. This paper examines one school organization development program for the benefits and costs realized in an "organically-oriented" change program. A series of summary observations on this case offers points of reflection for practitioners seeking prescriptions for their own behavior and for researchers seeking to increase our knowledge of change processes. (Author)

ED103953

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# MANAGING AN "ORGANISTICALLY-ORIENTED" SCHOOL INTERVENTION PROGRAM[1,2]

Louis E. Barrilleaux
Tulane University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Louis E. Barrilleaux
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

and

John R. Schermerhorn, Jr.
The University of Vermont

$2.50

EA 006 869

---

[1] A revised version of a paper originally presented at a symposium, "Selected Issues in Organizational Behavior and Structure," by The Special Interest Group on Organizational Theory, American Educational Research Association, Washington, April 2, 1975.

[2] The co-authors of this paper are listed alphabetically, and they acknowledge the contributions of the other participants in the Middle-Management Center to the data base of this study.

## INTRODUCTION

Among the many available strategies of social intervention (Hornstein, et al., 1971), organization development (OD) differentiates itself as "a collaborative process ... a transactional process of people working together to improve their mutual effectiveness in attaining their mutual objectives" (French and Bell, 1973: 200). Implicit to OD is a value structure in which true reciprocity between change agent and change client is the objective. This focus clearly emerges in Golembiewski's delineation of the following as among the basic foundation principals of OD:

> 1) OD programs should be fitted to the needs and perspectives of the client.
>
> 2) The prime OD goal is to have the client psychologically own a change-program, an owning based on participation and involvement (1971: 183).

In respect to intervention theory and method, Argyris (1970) elaborates this value structure in a description of "organistically-oriented" activities. Argyris sees such a posture contributing to the effectiveness of interventions by increasing the validity of information ultimately used for decision-making, and avoiding the tendencies of client systems to become dependent upon or withdraw from relationships between themselves and the interventionist.

While this orientation may well represent the principles of applied behavioral science in general, the scholarly literature has been negligent in addressing the dynamics of this "organic value" in action. Practically speaking, it is one thing to discuss the merits of the value, but quite another to effectively manage an intervention program governed by the value. Indeed, the change practitioner has recourse to few, if any, guidelines for managing

programs with the dual goals of achieving constructive change in a client system and achieving such change organistically. In an attempt to focus future research and dialogue on this managerial issue, the present paper critically examines the experience of one school intervention program in which a decision was made to operate with such an organic orientation.

## THE EDUCATION MIDDLE-MANAGEMENT CENTER[1]

The purpose of the Education Middle-Management Center (M-MC) is to improve schooling by engaging principalships from the New Orleans Area public schools in activities designed to increase their managerial effectiveness. M-MC consists of an intervention team, a client system of participating principals and school staffs, and a program director. The intervention strategy linking purpose with resources is simultaneous research and action (Brown: 1972) supported by continuing education. Financial support and legitimation is provided by The Kettering and Rockefeller Foundations and the New Orleans Public School System.

In effect, M-MC is a "resource mobilizing" capability, a device through which resources from university, school, and general community sources are interfaced to bring about constructive change in school management practices. As key inputs to this process, the members of the intervention team, the participating school principals, the director of M-MC and the intervention strategy all deserve a brief introduction.

---

[1] Further information on the Center, including a discussion of the intervention model and initial results, is available in Barrilleaux, Schermerhorn and Welsh (1975) or in various program documents available directly from Dr. Louis E. Barrilleaux, Middle-Management Center, Center for Education, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118.

Middle-Management Center Inputs

Intervention Strategy. Through simultaneous research (to increase understanding) and action (to facilitate constructive change), M-MC seeks to develop the problem-solving capabilities and proactivities in participating principalships. Such a strategy has been described by Clark as:

> A change oriented, knowledge gathering technique which is aimed at practical concerns of people in an immediate problematic situation and one in which the intention of all involved is to gather data about and to make changes in the properties of the system itself. (1972: 23).

Research-action in the M-MC context is unique in two respects. First, both formal surveys and systematic observation are employed to generate a data base for action. Once conceptualized and reflected upon, the data initiates the cyclical process for increasing understanding of the action contexts faced by participating principals. Second, this strategy is applied at two levels of action -- the individual school and school cluster levels. At the school level, a principal and a member of the intervention team relate dyadically in research-action; at the school cluster level, groups of principals and the intervention team engage in similar experiences.

As a complement to research-action, M-MC facilitates continuing educational experiences for principals. These experiences are mobilized as responses to "learning" needs discovered by principals while engaged in new problem-solving roles. At the core of the M-MC model, principals learn by doing; improved management practices should result from participating in situationally relevant problem-solving and educational activities.

Intervention Team. M-MC uses an interdisciplinary intervention team including academicians and practicing managers from diverse backgrounds. Members (RTMs -- resource team members) are recruited and selected for their

ability to contribute. They participate on a marginal, discretionary, or part-time basis. For the time period covered by this study, a period ending with the first operational year, the distribution of RTMs was the following: university-based (12), released time from management practice (3) and management consulting (3).

Client System. In the first high school feeder system with which linkages were established, elementary, middle, and senior high school principlas participated on a marginal time basis. In all cases, participation required the expenditure of both personal and normal working time.

The Director. Both the role and the person in the role of M-MC director are important to this study. As a role, the director is accountable for M-MC as an organization. This includes "managing" the intervention team, maintaining linkages between RTMs and the principals, and implementing the intervention strategy. The directorship is funded and staffed on a one-half time basis. The person in the role originated the M-MC idea and coordinated its movement from idea to reality.

Middle-Management Center Goals

During the first full active year (the time period of this study) the M-MC's operational goals were:

1) To develop the intervention team as a clinical resource.

2) To establish linkages with principalships in one high school feeder system.

3) To facilitate research-action and continuing education experiences in this feeder system linkage.

4) To initiate the formative and summative evaluation of M-MC as a school intervention program.

In working toward these goals, the intervention team members were guided by organistically-oriented as opposed to mechanistically-oriented (Argyris, 1970: 104) research-action activities.

## PURPOSE AND METHOD

M-MC, thus, seeks both change and change through organic methods. The experience of the authors in this activity[2] suggests that questions may appropriately be raised regarding the impact of the organic value on the change process and the persons involved in it. In particular, we think M-MC faced unique challenges in meeting its short term expectations -- challenges traceable in part to the adoption of the organic value. Through an eclectic analysis of M-MC's initial operating experience, this paper seeks to establish whether these questions and concerns are based on evidence.

The data base spans three sources. The first is the director's response to a series of structured interview questions (See Appendix). These questions address the meaning of the organic value and its impact on the intervention team, client system linkage, implementation of the change strategy and the role and person of the M-MC director. A case analysis of M-MC activities through its first operational year is the second data source (M-MC, 1974). Finally, reflections of the authors on their experiences in the program are the third data source.

The research question to be addressed through these data sources is: What impact has the organic value had on M-MC actors, processes, and outcomes?

---

[2] Co-author Barrilleaux is the director of M-MC.

## THE ORGANIC VALUE

As an exploratory program addressing the problems of urban school systems, M-MC focused initially on formative issues. The questions of concern were of the "who are we?", "what should we do?" and "how should we do it?" types. The following statement drawn from M-MC documents exemplifies the organization in this formative period.

> The initial characteristics of the team's operation were process-oriented rather than task-oriented. This was a conscious plan of the director. The scope of the project and its goals were deliberately imprecise and member input into decision making and goal clarification was sought.

From this beginning, the organic value gained formal status as an "operational assumption" of M-MC: The effectiveness of a Middle-Management Center and its clinical team(s) is a function of the "organic orientation."

It is important to ask at this juncture just why such a high emphasis was placed on this value. The answer lies in part with the challenges implicit to the M-MC concept itself. As the following observations of the director reflect, there was a distinct program logic associated with his sponsoring of the organic value as a basic M-MC operating norm.

> Initially, the general purpose of the project was to create a "social invention," a new response to the problems and needs of educational middle-managers -- a creative activity. No format could be provided. Staff members for the project were all operating on part-time, voluntary-time, or otherwise discretionary time commitments. Given these conditions and purposes under which the project was to function, it was recognized that any contribution which individuals could make would be initiated and maintained as a result of satisfaction and psychological success that individuals while working alone or as a group would experience. The project had to provide something which potential team members did not already possess. The organic posture was assumed to represent an opportunity that did not already

> exist in the academic, business, or management lives of potential members. In addition, the organic value was expected to facilitate the pooling of interdisciplinary information required for model building that would not otherwise occur. This model building, in turn, would require clarity and continual redefinition in the articulation of goals, objectives, strategies, and intended outcomes.

For the director, then, the organic value was not only something "good to be doing " in this context, it was felt to be a basic prerequisite to program success.

It is significant to the purposes of this paper to note that, although the value appeared early and in an institutional form, its meaning was not clearly established. In fact, this meaning was a subject of conjecture and some debate.

For the director, the organic value is "an 'internalized command' to maximize psychological ownership among all participants in all aspects of the intervention program" (emphasis added). As may be deduced from this statement the management style of the director placed a high priority on developing psychological ownership of M-MC by RTMs and principals. For the former, this meant "to the extent M-MC is what it is - it is owned by the RTMs who have bought in." In respect to the latter, it meant "the work of RTMs with principals is done in such a manner that principals claim psychological ownership for what is done in that interfacing." In terms of implementing the value, the director describes his own behavior as one of helping to "1) provide a continuous flow of information and feedback, and 2) create relationships in which members may influence goals, objectives, activities, and outcomes." Thus, the director views his role as one of providing an environment within which the M-MC participants have a valid opportunity to achieve a sense of ownership in resulting activities.

Two examples illustrate the organic value in action. First, in respect to the intervention team, the director notes,

> Initially a preliminary statement of purpose was presented to prospective members and immediately subjected to revision. Over a two-year period, purpose statements were revised six times and, even now they are periodically reexamined, clarified and frequently modified. Continuous feedback of information reinforces this reexamination and adjustment.

The second example of the organic value in action relates to the RTM and principalship linkage.[3]

> Cluster principals planned for and conducted their scheduled monthly session with the following specified goal and expected behaviors:
>
> Goal: To clarify interpretation of already available data and to plan to act upon it.
>
> Behavior:
>
> A. To receive the Ad Hoc Committee's report on declining enrollments and decide upon a plan of action
>
> B. To decide on action regarding sharing cluster wide school survey data with top-management personnel
>
> C. To further clarify individual school data concerning teacher perceptions of principals
>
> D. To decide cluster-wide action concerning released school achievement scores
>
> E. To decide what further skill development sessions are desired by the cluster

These two examples illustrate the theme of M-MC actors making decisions freely and from an information base, which ultimately affect their behavior as participants. This theme represents the essence of the organic value in action from the perspective of the director.

---

[3]It should be noted that this example derives from a relationship with a second high school feeder system. It is included here because of its clarity in representing the organic value in action at this operating level.

Actual M-MC experience suggests that operational reality is not uniformally consistent with these examples. When asked to define the "organic value," for example, 9 of 16 responding RTMs were hesitant about whether they knew what it was.[4] Their responses ranged from a straightforward "don't know" to the extreme of calling it a "joke." Standing in contrast to these 9, though, are the following definitions provided by 6 of their colleagues.

> Form follows functions ... therefore, form is dynamic because function constantly changes.
>
> Really all components come together and co-mingle for the best of all possible activities to develop without predestination. Move where the client is, developmental ...
>
> Such characteristics as -- open ended - developing - non bureaucratic; a philosophic respect for each group member - professionally and personally. An organic product would reflect the contribution of every member.
>
> A sense of ownership for the M-MC concept; participating in its origins, development and having a share in its success ...
>
> Ever changing ...
>
> Many individuals have input into the decision process ...

At least among these latter RTMs, there is evidence of a common or "core" meaning which corresponds to the director's perceptions. However, this core definition was not universally recognized by members of the intervention team.

In responding to a question regarding the perceived viability of the organic approach, 6 of 12 responding RTMs consider it at best "only occasionally appropriate" and, while the others consider it "appropriate in most situations," none admit that the organic value is "quite viable" in the M-MC

---

[4] Interviews constituting the source for this and data to follow were conducted by case analysis researchers. The number of respondents to the various questions will vary since some RTMs did not respond to all questions.

context. This is somewhat sobering in regard to a value issue with so much apparent face validity. Tho sobering quality of these responses is reinforced by the fact that two RTMs felt the value as implemented had been "counter productive" and "had little apparent value." These RTMs indicated "We have been very directive and structured,"and " ... really have not operated that way, manipulative at times."

The RTMs responsible for these latter comments appear to question not so much the value, but the fact they felt the value was not, or at least not consistently, implemented in M-MC behavior. In response to these comments, the director recognizes that frustration, particularly with respect to shortages of time and other resources, does lead to temporary mechanistic behavior.

Thus, while not denying the claims, the director links failures to operate in an organic manner to some experienced frustration. Herein, another issue emerges: What frustrations are relevant and, further, is an ability to manage such frustration a necessary quality for persons to operate effectively under the organic value? To investigate these issues, we now turn to an examination of the value's potential impact on:

1) The formation and maintenance of the intervention team.
2) The activities constituting the RTM/principal interfaces
3) The implementation of the intervention strategy.
4) The role and person of the M-MC director.

## EXPERIENCING THE ORGANIC VALUE

### The Intervention Team

Operating under the organic value, RTMs of the intervention team should have felt an opportunity to 1) act with autonomy, and 2) increase their own satisfaction and self-actualization as interventionists and members of a collegial team. Earlier we noted that the meaning of the organic value was ambiguous to over one-half of the RTMs, now we question the degree to which the implementation of the value actually impacted their behavior. It is possible that a commonly-held definition is not a prerequisite to the value having an impact on the behaviors of RTMs.

When questioned on the effect of the organic value in forming and developing the intervention team through the first operational year, the director sees the value as having facilitated emerging senses of commitment from a diverse pool of individual resources. An operational example was the director's concern to let new members serve as their own best judge of the role they should play in M-MC; there was no pre-cast mold for new members. When eventually queried on their perceived roles, in fact, RTMs each defined unique roles which defied cross correlation. Case analysis data lend support to the positive results of such a posture. RTMs indicate they had frequent feelings of impact on M-MC goals, action strategies, structure and policies. Apparently the director's allegiance to the organic value contributed to the emergence of psychological ownership among M-MC intervention team members.

The following comments of the director, however, suggest the above observations may be incomplete in reflecting the total impact of the organic value on the intervention team.

> ... an insufficient degree of early success is apparent for most participants ... participants with a high action-orientation demand of the director, "Tell me what you want me to do." During the development stages, there is also a tendency for members to influence organizing around their own competencies in an apparent effort to reduce risks, but at the cost of greater individuality, uniqueness, and openness within the group.

Eleven of 18 responding RTMs indicated having experienced conflict with one another over such things as objectives, action strategies and the role of "research" in M-MC operations. Such conflict may in itself have contributed to feelings of ultimate impact, but supporting data suggest a more cautious interpretation is in order. This is particularly true in respect to the formation of action commitments on the part of intervention team members.

At one point, for example, university-based RTMs expressed decreasing interest as the M-MC model itself gained sophistication. For this group, it seems, the kick was in building the model, not implementing it. The sense of ownership achieved during model-building did not carry through to the action implementation stage. This lack of action follow-through was not limited to this group of RTMs. Case researchers observe: "There is an inconsistency in the RTMs verbalization of a desire for action and the amount of time committed or proactivity demonstrated by RTMs." Further, the researchers noted that some RTMs reported feeling underutilized and frustrated by a lack of action and clarity in their M-MC roles. These feelings emerge from a setting described by the director as "no wrist slapping or punishment ... so dependent upon honest commitment and a sense of ownership." In this setting, the uniquely-defined roles of RTMs seemed to have been potentially dysfunctional. For the individual RTM there was frustration with role ambiguity; for M-MC the result was relative inaction.

The Intervention Team and Client System Interface

The impact of the organic value at the RTM and principal interface is less clear. The director held the following expectations:

> ... team members engage the clients in a continuous research-action cycle in which the client is "in charge" of his own as well as his organization's self renewal. Team members are not expected to feel any direct responsibility for client changes. Instead they are to create the kind of relationships with principals in which the principals exercise greater influence and autonomy over the quality of their own professional lives.

While initially rejected, the director sees these behaviors as having constituted a positive appeal to principals to participate with RTMs. In fact, of the 12 cluster principals, only 1 eventually failed to affiliate with M-MC. Any attribution of this "linkage percentage" to the effect of the organic value is tenuous, especially since the M-MC is legitimated by the power structure the principals are subordinate to. However, there is some indication in the data that the above operating mode may have been a contributing factor to this degree of linkage. Three principals specifically reported that the "non-directive" character of M-MC was the thing it does best. In addition, three self-noted "successful" RTMs describe their relations with principals as one of giving support and assistance while helping the principal develop potentialities already possessed.

There is also indication that this approach may have adversely affected the action involvement of principals. The case analysis notes that there was a lack of initial "proactivity" on the part of principals in identifying needed assistance from M-MC. In terms of their dyadic relationships with principals, RTMs generally considered them their least satisfying activities. These dyadic activities, also, were left up to the self-motivation of principals and RTMs; neither party perceived any consequences to be associated

with not working together in these relationships. Again, case researchers relate these outcomes to symptoms of role ambiguity and while the organic value appears to have encouraged some principal relationships with the M-MC, it also contributed to a lack of action in some of these same interfaces.

The positive role of the organic value is subject to some question. Where the role in fact appears negative, the reason appears to be with role ambiguity and frustration resulting in a perceived lack of performance.

The Intervention Strategy

Implementation of the intervention strategy produced controversy and limited results during the initial active M-MC operating period. Although 15 of 18 RTMs responding to a question on research-action considered it legitimate as a major M-MC goal, only 6 indicated it was a dominant theme in their interactions with principals. Ten of 16 responding RTMs reported few or none of their colleagues on the team saw research-action as part of their roles. Further, at school cluster meetings, it was felt that the director was the one mainly responsible for diagnostic behaviors. In summary, 10 of 15 RTMs felt that M-MC met with only limited success in research-action goals.

RTMs in active interfaces with principals seem to agree they are supposed to be, but state they are not, doing research-action. These data recall prior discussions of roles and performance expectations. In an atmosphere of self-motivation and control, research-action extended to actual "action" commitments seems to have suffered. Why? One issue which appeared in the case analysis as important in this respect is training. Ten of 15 responding RTMs felt M-MC did not meet their training needs. Their comments indicate a lack of certainty over requisite skills and expected behaviors in interacting with

principals. The issue of role ambiguity thus surfaces again, this time linked with RTMs' frustrations over inadequate preparation for action involvements with principals.

Similar outcomes are associated with the continuing education portion of the strategy. The data show 11 of 18 RTMs question at least partially the congruency of M-MC educational services with the needs of principals. Although a variety of services were provided during the initial operating period, many appeared opportunistic. This seems inconsistent with the organic value. This apparent opportunism may reflect ambiguities and lack of proactivities of both RTMs and principals in identifying learning needs in the course of their M-MC relationships.

The Director

The following statements reflect experienced benefits and costs of operating in the organic mode as perceived by the director.

> The major personal benefits have been in the increased consciousness of a self-renewal process. My confidence as both a manager and an interventionist is much greater than it has ever been. Specific benefits include 1) the sense of success derived from the manipulation of a "classical" educational environment in which an organically-oriented operation is sustained, and 2) the high sense of satisfaction derived from observing these occasions in which an intervention team is in action exercising its autonomy, applying self-renewing strategies, and "owning" success in traditionally difficult areas.
>
> The major personal costs centered about the personal time and psychological energy required to reduce the disparity between what I said and what I practiced, and the feeling that as director I seemed to loose my right to express frustration, anger and agression. This resulted from a battle of forces between personally internalizing the organic value and the perceived inconsistency of situational realities including:
>
> (1) Marginal-time commitments of participants.
>
> (2) Contradictory conditions of necessary interdependence and desired freedom of choice.

(3) Annual turnover of approximately one-third of the intervention team.

(4) Expressions of guilt feelings by RTMs when they perceive that they have failed to do something of "note or contribution."

(5) Continuous required expenditure of resources for program modification and renewal.

(6) Continuous requirements to resist short-range evaluation by clients, team members, funding sources, and significant others.

These reflections bring to mind the earlier comments in which periodic violations of the organic value are linked with experienced frustration. In the specific case of the director, there is evidence which indicates that such frustration may have caused several apparent behavioral contradictions. Each example involves an attempt by the director to cause an event or establish an action direction where none existed previously. Among them were the attempt to establish a series of RTM and principal task forces, to establish a research-evaluation task group, and to expand M-MC to include a second high school feeder system. In each case resistance to the moves was evident with typical responses being of the "you can't do it without my approval" type. It is further interesting to note that each of the above attempts eventually succeeded, notwithstanding the resistance, and each, in its own way, accounted for a substantial portion of M-MC activities and accomplishments during this initial operating period.

## SUMMARY

In reconsidering the discussion to this point, the following observations summarize the potential impact of the organic value on M-MC.

1) Operating under the organic value contributed to the director's ability to a) attract members of diverse educational backgrounds and occupational types to the M-MC intervention team, b) attract principals from a high school feeder system to interface with the members of the team, and c) develop among both RTMs and principals a sense of psychological ownership of the M-MC model.

The rationale for this statement lies in the intrinsic appeal offered by involvement in a new and developing organization with essentially non-directive norms. In M-MC, the climate established by the organic value appears to have offered both RTMs and principals opportunities to make individually-determined contributions.

M-MC data further suggest, however, that the impact of the organic value on the action follow-through is less clearly positive. The second observation summarizes this logic.

2) Operating under the organic value contributed to the perceived difficulty of RTMs and principals to demonstrate commitments to action within the context of the M-MC intervention model.

The operational impact of the organic value appeared conducive to the formation of role ambiguity and action frustration among both RTMs and principals. In a structure of self direction and control combined with marginal and discretionary time involvements, the situation appeared to result in discrepancies between verbal and action commitments of participants. These results were particularly noticeable in the inability of M-MC to completely implement its intervention strategy.

These two observations offer an interesting juncture in terms of reflecting on M-MC. Do they signify a situation of acute program distress and foreshadow the demise of M-MC, or do they represent the establishment of a departure point prerequisite to the success of such an endeavor? Experience of M-MC in its second active year tends to support the latter position and,

therefore, the initial program logic under which the organic value was originally established as part of M-MC. A complete treatment of these questions, however, waits more specific documentation of M-MC's progress in its now maturing stage.

The final summary observation centers on the M-MC director.

> 3) Operating under the organic value contributed to personal frustrations for the director which, in turn, resulted in behavioral contradictions at times and longer-term feelings of paying a high "personal price" for operating in this organic style.

The director's behavior indicated that allegiance to the value in this situation of high task-orientation and demand was not easy. At times, in fact, it was not possible. Furthermore, inherently high feelings of ambiguity and frustration must be dealt with to operate effectively under organic guidelines in the director role. Above all, it seems that the role of M-MC director demands patience. Under the organic value it has taken a relatively long period of "formative" time for M-MC to develop prerequisite capabilities to achieve its ultimate goals. The director's vision and expectations, in such a case, must be long-range.

## IMPLICATIONS

Overall, and as implemented by the director, the organic value appears associated in the M-MC context with certain potential benefits and potential associated costs. We use the qualified "potential" as a reminder that other factors in the case may account as well or even better for some of the behaviors discussed above. Our intent has been to offer a thought-provoking

view at something we seem to neglect in our consideration of school intervention programs, i.e., what it means to attempt change under program norms and guidelines established by the organic value. This study of M-MC as one case-in-point suggests that the manager of such an intervention program will face challenges, both organizational and personal, in attempting to realize the potential advantages of the organic value. At the very least, this study suggests the manager should approach this task with certain behavioral guidelines in mind. Among them are:

1) Give earliest attention to establishing priorities for quantity and quality of information sharing between participants.

2) Operate under the organic value only as an early conscious choice of participants.

3) Assume a proactive stance in reflecting with participants on the meaning of the organic value.

4) Recognize that the more organic the posture, the greater will be the time demands for learning to behave according to the value set.

5) Recognize that sometimes you and others will behave inorganically.

6) Prepare for the customarily high "start-up" costs to be continuous.

7) Develop early clarity in statements of purpose, goals, and objectives and "revisit" them continuously and subject to modification.

8) Require prospective intervention team members to invest a period of observation and interaction before making any commitments.

9) Recognize that verbal statements of commitment may tend to exceed action follow-through.

10) Resist premature or crisis-oriented demands for results.

11) Learn to wait dynamically.

This paper raises questions we think are of importance to the researcher of organizational change processss as well as to the change practitioner. Whether or not the organic value accounted for the behaviors discussed in this paper and underlying the three summary observations, a complete treatment of the role of the organic value in school intervention programs remains an open and appealing empirical question. There is the further question of whether it is the organic value or the way the value was operationalized that accounted for the behaviors identified in this study. Finally, there is the question of just what the trade-offs are between timeliness of action, which appears to be a liability of the organic value, and ultimate validity of action, which is one of the supposed benefits. The fact that these questions emerge at all challenges all of us to research such issues as we are changing.

REFERENCES


Argyris, Chris, Intervention Theory and Method (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970).

Barrilleaux, Louis E., John R. Schermerhorn, Jr. and J. Steven Welsh, "The Research-Action Context: An Intervention Strategy in Educational Management Development," (Washington, D. C.: AERA, April, 1975).

Brown, J. David, "'Research-Action:' Organizational Feedback, Understanding and Change," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol 8, No. 4, 1972, pp. 697-711.

Clark, Peter A., Action Research and Organizational Change (New York: Harper and Row, 1972).

French, Wendell L. and Cecil H. Bell, Jr., Organization Development (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973).

Golembiewski, R. T., "Toward Further Development of OD," Academy of Management Proceedings, 1971, pp. 183-185.

Hornstein, Harvey A., Barbara Benedict Bunder, W. Warner Burke, Marion Gindes and Roy J. Lewicki (eds.), Social Intervention: A Behavioral Science Approach (New York: The Free Press, 1971).

Middle-Management Center, Developing A Prototype Educational Middle-Management Center, A Report of Phase II -- Case Analysis, November, 1974.

## APPENDIX

### INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

### FOR THE MIDDLE-MANAGEMENT CENTER (M-MC) DIRECTOR

### ON THE "ORGANIC VALUE"

1. As the coordinator of M-MC activities, what does operating under the "organic value" mean to you? Specifically --

   a. define the organic value;

   b. show how you try to implement/operationalize the organic value 1) in your own behavior, 2) in the M-MC policies and behavior;

   c. indicate what the organic value should mean to members of 1) the intervention team (RTMs) and 2) the client system (principals);

   d. indicate your expectations regarding the behaviors of members of the intervention team as conveyors of the organic value in their relationships with the client system;

   e. state the clearest example you recall from M-MC's history of "the organic value in action;"

   f. state specifically the expected benefits or positive outcomes you were anticipating when including the organic value as part of your operation strategy.

2. Consider your purpose as director of M-MC to become effecting a linkage between an intervention team and client system to achieve planned change. How do you think the organic value affected (positively and negatively):

   a. the formation and development of the intervention team?

   b. the formation and development of the team-client system linkage?

   c. the achievement of change goals through application of the research-action and educational strategies?

   d. give specific examples where required to clarify your responses to 2-a, 2-b, and 2-c.

3. From your personal viewpoint as the person ultimately accountable (personally, socially and from external funding sources) for M-MC outcomes and management, how has the organic value operating mode affected you?

   a. positively: what have been the major personal benefits or payoffs?

   b. negatively: what have been the major personal costs?

   c. state the clearest example you know where 1) you personally benefited from the organic value, 2) you personally paid a price for the organic value (include other examples if you feel they are elucidating).

4. Reflect on questions 2 and 3, and your responses to each. In each case do you consider the negative effects or costs to be:

   a. attributable to a failure to implement the organic value properly (this implies such effects are avoidable)?

   b. direct associates of the very nature of the organic value itself (this implies such effects will be unavoidable)?

   c. give supporting examples or data to clarify your responses in 4-a and 4-b.

5. Consider your self a mentor for change practitioners interested in operating under the organic value. State the guidelines you would establish for them to follow to facilitate their managing change effectively under this value system.